DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 351 728 CS 507 999

AUTHOR Coombs, W. Timothy; And Others
TITLE A Comparative Analysis of International Public Relations Practices, Phase Two: Interpretations of Differences and Similarities between Professionalization in Austria, Norway, and the U.S.
PUB DATE Aug 92
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (75th, Montreal, Quebec, Canada, August 5-8, 1992).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Analysis of Variance; Comparative Analysis; Factor Analysis; Foreign Countries; Media Research; *Professional Autonomy; *Professional Development; Professional Personnel; *Public Relations
IDENTIFIERS Austria; Norway; Transnational Corporations; United States

ABSTRACT

A study examined the similarities and differences which exist in the professionalization of pubic relations in Austria, Norway, and the United States. Subjects, 136 of 188 members of the Public Relations Verband Austria, 150 of 300 members of the Informasjonsforeningen (Norway), and 272 of 500 members of the Public Relations Society of America, completed questionnaires. Differences and similarities were isolated by examining concepts of the ideal job, the actual job, public relations development, and public relations role. Cultural values, educational systems, and history were used to explain the differences and similarities. Results indicated that: (1) practitioners in all three countries evidenced similarities in the autonomy dimension of the ideal job but differences on the prestige dimension; (2) practitioners differed on the autonomy dimension of the actual job; (3) even though it was anticipated that American public relations practitioners would have the strongest public relations development scores, there were strong reasons why Austrian practitioners actually scored higher than those in America; (4) public relations history fails to account (but education can) for Austria having the highest percentage of managers. Findings provide a starting point for identifying which elements of public relations practice should be standardized and which should be customized. The finding of a shared view of autonomy in the ideal job held by all practitioners suggest that public relations has made progress toward developing a professional attitude. (Three tables of data are included.) (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED351728

A Comparative Analysis of International Public Relations Practices, Phase Two: Interpretations of Differences and Similarities between Professionalization in Austria, Norway, and the U.S.

W. Timothy Coombs
Assistant Professor
Department of Communication
Illinois State University
Normal, IL 61704

Sherry Holladay
Assistant Professor
Department of Communication
Illinois State University
Normal, IL 61704

Gabriele Hasenauer
Masters Candidate
Department of Journalism and Communications
University of Salzburg
A-5010 Salzburg, Austria

Tore Slaata
Professor
Norwegian Graduate School of Marketing
Trondheimsvn. 2, P.b. 4676 Sofienberg
0506 Oslo 5, Norway

Benno Signitzer
Associate Professor
Department of Journalism and Communications
University of Salzburg
A-5010 Salzburg, Austria

CS507999

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
W. Timothy Coombs

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A Comparative Analysis of Public Relations Practices, Phase Two: Interpretations of Differences and Similarities of Professional Practices in Austria, Norway, and the U.S.

Practitioners and scholars have come to realize the importance of international public relations. Textbooks are expanding their treatment of the topic while the practitioner and academic journals are devoting more time to international public relations.[1] Beyond the dearth of international public relations research, the extant research suffers from the inappropriate use of single-culture studies to create comparative knowledge about public relations practices in various countries (e.g., Wilcox, Ault, & Agee, 1991). Moreover, many international public relations studies are actually what Botan (1992) terms "trans-border" public relations. Trans-border public relations refers to multinational corporations controlling public relations efforts worldwide from the home country. The purpose of this research project was to conduct comparative research in order to contrast effectively the public relations practices in the U.S., Austria, and Norway.

Professionalization was selected as the point of comparison due to its continued concern and import to the occupation of public relations (Ehling, 1992). This project sought to examine the similarities and differences which exist in the professionalization of these three countries. The study begins with the isolation of the differences and similarities, moves to

a discussion of possible explanatory factors, and concludes with an interpretation of these differences and similarities.

Rationale and Design

The topic of professionalization and the countries of Austria, Norway, and the U.S. were selected for very specific reasons. Professionalization was selected because it remains an important concern in the field of public relations (Ehling, 1992). The concern for professionalization stems from professionalization's ramifications for an occupation. For example, practitioners who view themselves as professionals will interact with others in ways different from non-professional (McKee, Nayman, & Lattimore, 1975, McLeod & Hawley, 1964). Acting like professionals is a step toward professionalization and occupational respect.

If length of time public relations is practiced in a country shapes the development of the field, Austria, Norway, and the U.S. should represent countries in three difference steps of public relations development. (In this study development is operationalized as professionalization). The United States is assumed to be the most developed since public relations has existed there the longest. Austria's public relations development is similar to that of Germany's, which is assumed to be second only to the U.S. in terms of public relations development. Norway is assumed to be the least developed since the practice of public relations is relatively new there (Johansson, 1991).

Procedures

The respondents for the study were selected from professional public relations organizations in the U.S., Austria, and Norway. In Austria, the sample was a census of all members of the Public Relations Verband Austria (PRVA), the public relations association of Austria. A total of 136 of the 188 respondents returned completed questionnaires for a 71.8% response rate. In Norway, the sample was a random selection of members of the Informasjonsforeningen. A total of 150 of the 300 respondents returned completed questionnaires for a 50% response rate. In the United States, the sample was composed of a skip interval sample of Public Relations Society of America (PRSA) members. After selecting a random starting point, every 20th member listed in the 1991-92 PRSA director was placed into the sample.[2] A total of 500 respondents were selected and 272 usable questionnaires were received for a 54.4% response rate. In each country, the respondent was mailed a questionnaire, a cover letter explaining the nature of the study, and a postage paid return envelope.

Variables

The questionnaire sought to collect professionalization and demographic information. The professionalization data was composed of three separate measures: McLeod and Hawley's (1964) professionalization measure, Broom's (1982) practitioner role measure, and a set of three items designed to tap attitudes toward professional development.

Professionalization

The primary measure of professionalization was McLeod and Hawley's (1964) scale for assessing professionalization. The scale contains 24 job characteristic items, 12 items measure professional characteristics while the other 12 measure non-professional characteristics. The scale was originally designed for journalists but has been adapted and used to assess public relations practitioners (McKee et al., 1975; Pratt, 1986).

The McLeod and Hawley (1964) instrument actually measures two concepts, the ideal job and the actual job. The ideal job is a measure of the practitioners' desired professional characteristic. Respondents are asked to indicate how much they value each of the 12 job characteristics of any job. The actual job is a measure the extent to which the 12 job characteristics are fulfilled in the practitioners' jobs. The respondent is given the same job characteristics and asked to indicate how well each of the items is provided in the their current job. A total of 10 professional items were selected for this study. The number of items was reduced from 24 to 10 to keep the questionnaire to a manageable length.

Public Relations Roles

Practitioner roles was used as a second measure of professionalization. A practitioner's role was assessed using Broom's scale (Broom, 1982; Broom & Dozier, 1986; Broom & Smith, 1979). Although four roles are posited in theory, research using

the scale has shown consistently that only two roles emerge from the analyses (Lauzen, 1992; Reagan, Anderson, Sumner, & Hill, 1990). Those two roles are the public relations manager and the public relations technician. The public relations manager role involves planning a public relations campaign and is a composite of the expert practitioner, communication facilitator, and the problem-solving process facilitator. The public relations technician role acts to produce public relations materials (Broom & Dozier, 1986). As practitioners become more professional, they should move from a technician to a managerial perspective. A total of 8 items were used in this study, four each for the technician and managerial roles.[3]

Public Relations Development

The public relations development variable attempted to measure the strength of a practitioner's desire for professional improvement. Three items were used to assess public relations development. Two items dealt with training and one dealt with ethics. These three items were taken from McKee, Nayman, and Lattimore's (1975, p. 51) list of professional improvement items. It was anticipated that public relations practitioners in Austria, Norway, and the U.S. would differ in their public relations development scores.[4]

Analyses: Identification of Differences and Similarities

The first step in this project was comparison: How do public relations practice vary in Austria, Norway, and the U.S. in terms of professionalization? The differences and

similarities were isolated by examining the ideal job, actual job, public relations development, and public relations roles concepts.

Ideal Job

The ideal job variable was used to determine how strongly public relations practitioners felt 10 professional characteristics were important in any job. This variable was used to determine if public relations practitioners held some professional attitude which transcended culture. Such a transcendant attitude has been found among journalists (McLeod & Rush, 1969, p. 590).

A series of one-way ANOVAs revealed that the Austrian, Norwegian, and American public relations practitioners had similar responses on 5 items (items 1, 3, 7, 9, and 10) and different responses on 5 items (items 2, 4, 5, 6, and 10). (See Appendix A for the complete wording of each item). A factor analysis with Varimax rotation was performed to identify clusters of related variables. Table 1 provides the full results of the factor analysis. Two factors emerged from the analysis. Factor one reflected a concern for autonomy and actually performing one's job duties and was labeled autonomy:

> Making full use of your abilities and training. (Item 1)
>
> Having an opportunity for originality and initiative. (Item 2)
>
> Having an opportunity to learn new skills and Knowledge. (Item 3)
>
> Having freedom for continual close supervision over your work. (Item 9)

Factor two reflected a concern for career advancement and prestige and was labeled prestige:

Getting ahead in your professional career. (Item 4)

Working with a well know and respected organization. (Item 5)

Having an opportunity to influence public thinking. (Item 7)

Having a superior who appreciates what you do (Item 8)

The results of the factor analysis were used to create the composite variables of the autonomy and prestige dimensions. Since the factors represent overlap in measurement, creating these two dimensions retains the central concepts. Each dimension was created by adding together the items in each factor and dividing by the total number of items in that dimension. Reliabilities for the composite variables were acceptable with autonomy-ideal reporting a Cronbach alpha of .71 and prestige-ideal a Cronbach's alpha of .64.

The practitioners in the three nations evidenced similar responses on 3 of the 4 autonomy dimension items. A one-way ANOVA using the autonomy dimension as the independent variable was executed to determine if practitioners in the three countries showed similarities or differences in responses to the autonomy dimension. The results showed no difference (F (2, 528) = 1.54, p = .22) between Austrian, Norwegian, and American practitioners.

The practitioners in the three countries evidenced different

scores on 3 of the 4 prestige dimension items. A one-way ANOVA was used to determine if practitioners in the three countries showed similar or different responses to the prestige dimension. The results showed a significant difference (F (2, 532) = 13.41, $p < .001$) between Austrian, Norwegian, and American practitioners for the prestige-ideal variable.

Actual Job

The actual job variable was used to measure to what extent each of ten professional characteristics were fulfilled in a practitioner's actual job. It was anticipated that public relations practitioners in Austria, Norway, and the U.S. would differ in their actual job scores. According to the one-way ANOVA analyses, the Austrian, Norwegian, and American practitioners differed on seven items (1, 2, 3, 6, 9, and 10) and were similar on 3 items (4, 5, and 8). (See Appendix A for the complete wording of the items). As with the ideal job, a factor analysis with varimax rotation was performed to determine if the ten actual job items grouped in a meaningful way. Table 2 provides the results of the factor analysis.

The factor analysis for the actual job items provided a two-factor solution very similar to that which emerged for the ideal job items. The two factors fit the same autonomy and prestige labels. The autonomy factor was composed of five items:

> Making full use of you abilities and training. (Item 1)
>
> Having an opportunity for originality and initiative. (Item 2)

Having and opportunity to learn new skills and knowledge. (Item 3)

Having freedom from continual close supervision over your work. (Item 9)

Having an influence on important decisions. (Item 10)

The only change from the ideal job factor analysis is the movement of item 10 from being in neither factor to loading on the autonomy factor. The prestige factor was composed of three items:

Getting ahead in your professional career. (Item 4)

Working with a well known and respected organization. (Item 5)

Having a superior who appreciates what you do. (Item 8)

The only difference from the ideal job factor analysis was the movement of item seven from the prestige factor to not fitting into either factor.

The results of the factor analysis were used to create the composite variables for the autonomy dimension and the prestige dimension. Each composite variable was created by adding together the items in each dimension and then dividing by the total number of items in that dimension. Reliabilities for the autonomy and prestige dimensions were .79 and .65 (Cronbach's alphas). These two composite variables were used in subsequent data analyses.

A one-way ANOVA analysis was executed to compare practitioners in the three countries on the autonomy dimension of the actual job. The results revealed a significant difference

between Austrian, Norwegian, and American practitioners for the autonomy-actual variable (F (2, 530) = 17.18, p < .001). An LSD pairwise follow-up analyses found differences between practitioners in all three countries. Austrian (M = 1.52) practitioners reported the greatest fulfillment of autonomy in their actual jobs followed by Norwegian (M = 1.71) and then American practitioners (M = 1.86).

A one-way ANOVA analyses was performed to compare practitioners in the three countries on the prestige-actual variable. The results showed a significant difference between Austrian, Norwegian, and American practitioners for the prestige-actual variable (F (2, 508) = 5.11, p < .01). The LSD pairwise follow-up analyses found the U.S. to be the source of the difference. American practitioners reported the least fulfillment on the prestige dimension of the actual job. American (M = 2.25) practitioners scored significantly lower on the prestige-actual variable than their counterparts in Austria (M = 2.06) and Norway (M = 1.96). Since the U.S. practitioners have the strongest desire for prestige, their low prestige-actual variable scores suggests a strong source of dissatisfaction for American public relations practitioners.

According to the results of the one-way ANOVA analyses, practitioners in Austria, Norway, and the U.S. did differ on their responses to all three public relations development items. On the question of whether one's responsibility to the public should outweigh one's responsibility to the employer (the ethics

item), the LSD pairwise comparison revealed significant differences between all three countries. The Austrian practitioners (M = 2.48) demonstrated the strongest desire to maintain responsibility to the public followed by the Americans (M = 2.84) and then the Norwegians (M = 3.70). On the question of the need for certification, the Austrian (M = 2.64) and the American (M = 2.84) respondents shared similar scores with both proving to be stronger than the scores of the Norwegian (M = 3.73) practitioners. On the question of the need to attend seminars to keep current with the field, the American (M = 2.02) and the Norwegian (M = 2.10) practitioners shared similar scores with both being weaker than the scores of the Austrian (M = 1.68) practitioners.

Practitioner Roles

The practitioner roles were divided into manager and technicians. This classification system resulted in the creation of two categorical variables. A 2x3 chi-square analysis treating role as a nominal variable (=(2, N = 483)= 35.89, p < .001) revealed a significant difference in practitioner roles due to country. The U.S. (70.2%) and Austrian (75.4%) practitioners were more likely to be managers while the Norwegian (58.6%) practitioners were more likely to be technicians. The role differences can be explained by a combination of history (the length of public relations' practice in a country) and education.

Interpretive Tools: Values, Education and History

Identifying the differences in public relations professionalization in Austria, Norway, and the U.S. is the first step in this study. The second step is to provide a theoretically based interpretation of those differences and similarities. Cultural values, educational systems, and public relations' history each country will be tendered as ways to understand the similarities and difference found in the public relations practices of Austria, Norway, and the U.S.

Culturally Situated, Work-Related Values

In 1984, the Dutch organizational researcher Geert Hofstede reported the results of an extensive 40 country, polycentric research project. The project focused on plotting the value structures which reflect culture. The end result was the identification of "four main dimensions along which dominant value systems in the 40 countries can be ordered and which affect human thinking, organizations, and institutions in predictable ways" (Hofstede, 1984). This led Hofstede to conclude that organizations are culture-bound. Culture affects both the behavior in an organization and how the organization functions as a whole. Public relations is a form of organizational behavior or a form of behavior by organizations. If culture shapes organizational behavior, it follows that culture should have consequences for the performance of public relations. Therefore, Hofstede's (1984) culturally situated, work-related values offer

a starting point for the explanation of differences and similarities in practitioners' professional orientations.

Hofstede's (1984) work is premised on the belief that values are part of the "building blocks of culture" (p. 21). Values are defined as "a broad tendency to prefer certain states of affairs over others" (Hofstede, 1984, p. 18). Culture is defined "as the collective programming of the mind which distinguishes the members of one human group from another" (Hofstede, 1984, p. 21). The assumption is that shared values can lead members of the same culture to share mental programming--guides for action. He developed a survey instrument to identify the underlying values in a culture. Analysis of the extensive data base revealed four dimensions of culture: power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism, and masculinity.

As conceptualized by Hofstede (1984), power distance refers to inequities in societies. This dimension measures how influences or interpersonal power is perceived by people in the least powerful position. Uncertainty avoidance refers to how cultures adapt to uncertainty about the future. This dimension measures how well people cope with uncertainty. Individualism refers to the relationship between the collective and the individual. This dimension assesses how individualistic or collective the society tends to be. Masculinity refers to differences between the sexes. This dimension measures how people deal with the differences between the sexes--is there a

large or small difference in societal sex roles? Cultures were found to vary along all four dimensions of culture.

To appreciate the relevance of Hofstede's work to this research project, it is necessary to elaborate on how Austria, Norway, and the U.S. vary along his four dimensions of culture. Table 3 provides a quick, visual depiction of how Austria, Norway, and the U.S. compare on the four dimensions of culture. These differences should have ramifications since the dimensions of culture do manifest themselves in behaviors.

On the power dimension, the U.S. and Norway are both classified as medium while Austria is considered low. The U.S. and Norway should differ from Austria on power-related traits. On the uncertainty avoidance dimension, Austria is high while Norway and the U.S. are low. Austrians should demonstrate a difference from Norwegians and Americans on uncertainty reduction traits. On the individualism dimension, all three nations are above the mean with the U.S. being very high and Austria being more toward medium. This suggests that people in the U.S. will manifest stronger individualism traits. On the masculinity dimension, Austria and the U.S. are high while Norway is very low. Norwegians should be different from Austrian and Americans when it comes to masculinity traits. The dimensions of culture serve as an initial framework for the interpretation of differences and similarities found in the professional orientation of practitioners.

Educational Systems

The public relations education systems in each country have some distinctive features which can contribute to the understanding the differences and similarities found the public relations practices. The U.S. public relations education model evolved from journalism. The journalism model tends to be craft-oriented. A craft orientation places the emphasis on learning skills (Hazleton & Cutbirth, 1991). In contrast, the Austrian public relations educational model evolved more from mass communication and is theory-oriented. Austrian students are emersed in theory to a much greater extent than are American students. Skills are seen as something the Austrian student should have either before coming to the university or should be learned on the job. Even the Austrian practitioners who were trained in journalism or business share this same theoretical orientation which emphasizes the value of education as an ends unto itself (Hazleton & Cutbirth, 1991).

In contrast to Austria and the U.S., the Norwegians are just beginning to develop a specialized public relations curriculum. Most current public relations practitioners in Norway have been trained in other fields, including journalism, business, and political science. The Norwegian Graduate School of Marketing (NMH) is the pioneer in public relations education in Norway. NMH has developed the first true public relations degree sequence in Norway. The public relations education model used at the NMH primarily is an American model since American

academicians were consulted in the development of the program. Currently the Norwegian practitioners come from other disciplines such as business and journalism. Because of their diverse backgrounds, is difficult to speculate on the nature of their training at this time.

History

History also can add to an explanation of why practitioners in all three nations differ in some respects. Public relations history in the U.S. has documented a shift in focus as public relations matures as a practice. The shift in focus is from an inward concern for client only to an outward concern for publics and society as well. Grunig's (Grunig & Hunt, 1984) four public relations models and Baskin and Aronoff's (1991) developmental stages of public relations both reflect the shift from an inward to an outward focus. It appears the field of public relations needs time to evolve into a societal concern.

Application of the Interpretive Tools

The analyses revealed the similarities and differences between Austrian, Norwegian, and American public relations practitioners for the concepts of the ideal job, actual job, professional development, and public relations roles. This final section uses cultural values, educational systems, and history to explain those differences and similarities.

Ideal Job

Practitioners in all three countries evidenced similarities in the autonomy dimension of the ideal job. Scores on Hofstede's

individualism dimension of culture would suggest practitioners might hold different views on the autonomy items. The U.S., Austria, and Norway practitioners all reported quite different individualism scores. Low individualism countries, such as Austria, place greater importance on training and skills than do high individualism countries (Hofstede, 1984). The similarities on the autonomy-ideal variable lends additional support to the belief that training leads public relations practitioners to share a professional attitude which transcends culture. Responses of practitioners in all three countries were consistent on the autonomy dimension even though their cultural profiles suggest practitioners in the three countries should have disagreed upon an autonomy variable.

Practitioners in Austria, Norway, and the U.S. revealed differences on the prestige dimension of the ideal job. The three nations' locations on Hofstede's individualism and uncertainty dimensions of culture would predict just such differences. High individualism countries evidence a strong need for achievement as do low uncertainty avoidance countries as well. The U.S. has the highest individualism and lowest uncertainty avoidance scores of the three countries (Hofstede, 1984).

The pairwise follow-up analysis confirmed that for the prestige dimension, the U.S. ($\underline{M}$ = 1.81) reported the strongest scores and was the source of the differences found between the countries. Austria ($\underline{M}$ = 2.06) and Norway ($\underline{M}$ = 2.05) evidenced

similar scores on prestige dimension. (Due to the coding system, the lower the number, the stronger the score is for a variable). The high U.S. scores are what created the differences found in the one-way ANOVA analysis. Public relations training could not overcome the strong cultural need to achieve which is imbedded in the American culture. In fact, the American educational system reinforces the need to achieve with its "get a job" focus (Hazleton & Cutbirth, 1991).

In summary, the differences and similarities found in the ideal job items can be explained in terms of perceptions of the autonomy and prestige dimensions of the ideal job. Practitioners differentiated between autonomy and prestige dimensions. The autonomy dimension was tied more closely to a professional attitude than to cultural values. Conversely, the prestige dimension was tied more closely to cultural values than to professional attitude.

Actual Job

Practitioners in the three countries differed on the autonomy dimension of the actual job. An explanation of these differences can be found in the individualism dimension of culture. In low individualism countries, both organizations and employees place greater emphasis on training, skills, and education than in high individualism countries (Hofstede, 1984). The cultural dimension is reinforced by an educational system which stresses the value of education in and of itself (Hazleton & Cutbirth, 1991). Whereas a professional attitude can suppress

cultural differences on the ideal job scores, cultural differences did appear during the performance of a practitioner's job (i.e., the actual job scores). Although public relations practitioners hold autonomy-related professional attitudes that seem unaffected by a particular culture, the actual performance of the job within the culture does create differences in the fulfillment of autonomy-related professional characteristics.

Professional Development

Differences in the educational system and professional organizations provide a useful frame of reference from which to interpret the responses to the public relations development items. The Austrian educational system in general is more amenable to the development of a professional orientation. The emphasis on theory and learning as an ends rather than as a means fosters a professional outlook among the Austrian graduates. The Austrian practitioners are taught to value education and to adopt a managerial perspective. In contrast, the American public relations education system places its emphasis on more short-term concerns such as skills and using education as a means to the end of securing a job (Hazleton & Cutbirth, 1991). Hence, the comparison of countries' educational systems can explain the overall strength of the Austrian practitioner's scores on the professional development questions.

The development of public relations in Austria has been accelerated by the Austrian emphasis on education (Hazleton & Cutbirth, 1991), the cultural emphasis on collectivity (Hofstede,

1984), and the developmental stage at which public relations began in Austria. Austria saw the development of public relations after World War II, which was relatively late in comparison to the U.S. The Austrians shunned the idea of publicity because it was associated too closely with propaganda. Instead of beginning with publicity, the Austrians learned from the American experience by starting their public relations practice at the information stage. Thus, public relations in Austria began at a more developed stage than it did in the U.S. The acceleration has moved Austrian practitioners past American practitioners in terms of the concern for society verses the client. Norway lags behind both Austrian and the U.S. Norway's development has been hindered by the very short history of public relations in the Nordic countries. In summary, even though American public relations practitioners were anticipated to have the strongest public relations development scores, there are strong reasons to explain why Austrian practitioners actually scored higher than those in America.

Practitioner Roles

History provides a starting point for explaining to composition of technician and managers in Austria, Norway, and the U.S. As a practitioner remains in the field, s/he is more likely to progress from the technician role to the managerial role (Broom & Smith, 1986). A chi-square analysis of practitioner role by years in pubic relations (=(4, N = 478)= 19.85, $p < .001$) lends some support to this claim. A total of

53.6% of the technicians had been in public relations 5 years or less compared to 39.4% of the managers. A total of 41.9% of the managers had been in public relations for over 11 years compared to only 25% of the technicians. Since the U.S. has the longest public relations history and Norway the shortest, the U.S. would be expected to have a higher percentage of managers and Norway a higher percentage of technicians.

Public relations history fails to account for Austria having the highest percentage of managers. The U.S. has a longer public relations history than Austria, yet the two countries have very similar percentages of managers. Education can help to explain the heavy concentration of managers Austrian public relations. The educational system in Austria facilitates the development of a managerial orientation with its emphasis on theory and research. The Austrian system is more concerned with the development of "managerial" skills than with the development of "technician" skills (Hazleton & Cutbirth, 1991). The high percentage of Austrian practitioners found in the managerial role is attributed to an educational system which promotes managerial orientation.

Implications

Reflecting back on the results and explanations of the analyses, implications from this research project take two forms. First, there are implications for the practice of international public relations. Following the lead of marketing and advertising, international public relations confronts the choice

between globalization (standardizing practices) and localization (customizing practices to the local market). Globalization and localization should be viewed as complementary options rather than as either/or choices. Where there are similarities, standardize the practice. Where there are differences, customize the practice (Oviatt, 1988).

Our comparative analysis revealed similarities and differences in professional orientations in Austria, Norway, and the U.S. Professional orientations shape behaviors. Thus, this study provides a starting point for identifying which elements of the public relations practice should be standardized and which should be customized. For example, U.S. practitioners would respond well to prestige-based incentives while Austrian practitioners would see little merit on placing press releases. The next step in this research project will be to build upon the professional orientation foundation by discovering how the similarities and differences manifest themselves in the execution of public relations.

Second, some insights were gained into the professionalization of public relations. A professional orientation is required for professionalization. The shared view of autonomy in the ideal job held by all practitioners suggests that public relations has made progress toward developing a professional attitude. A key element in that development is the educational system. A greater emphasis on theory, research, and the value of learning moves practitioners

beyond the narrow limits of the technician to the more expansive outlook of the manager. If a country truly wishes to promote a professional orientation, that country should examine how it trains its public relations practitioners. Training will help the practitioner fulfill his/her professional desires in the actual job.

Public relations has been drawn into the vortex of internationalism. Comparative research is necessary to expand knowledge about this little researched area and to understand how pursuing public relations across national boundaries affects the execution of public relations. This study marks a beginning as it attempts to map the differences and similarities found in international public relations through the examination of practitioners' professional orientations in Austria, Norway, and the U.S. The next step is to move beyond this conceptual foundation to discover how these difference become manifest in the actual practice of public relations in different countries.

References

Baskin, O., & Aronoff, C. (1991). Public relations: The profession and the practice. Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown Publishers.

Botan, C. (1992). International public relations: Critique and reformation. Public Relations Review, 18(2), 149-160.

Broom, G.M. (1982 Fall). Comparison of sex roles in public relations. Public Relations Review, 8, 17-22.

Ehling, W. P. (1992). Public relations education and professionalism. In J.E. Grunig (Ed.), Excellence in public relations and communication management (pp. 439-466). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Grunig, J.E., & Hunt, T. (1984). Managing public relations. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Hazleton, V., & Cutbirth, C. (Nov. 1991). Communication and public relations theory: Applications in the European

economic community. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Convention, Atlanta, Ga.

Hofstede, G. (1984). Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Johansson, L. (1991 December). A new dawn arrives in the north. Public Relations Journal, 16-17.

Lauzen, M.M. (1992). Public relations roles, intraorganizational power, and encroachment. Journal of Public Relations Research, 2, 61-80.

McKee, B.K., Nayman, O.B., & Lattimore, D.L. (November 1975). Now pr people see themselves. Public Relations Journal, 47-52.

McLeod, J.M., & Hawley, S.E. Jr. (Autumn 1964). Professionalization among newsmen. Journalism Quarterly, 41, 529-538, 577.

McLeod, J.M., & Rush, R.R. (Autumn 1969). Professionalization of Latin American and U.S. journalists. Journalism Quarterly, 46, 538-590.

Oviatt, F. Jr. (Spring 1988). PR without boundaries: Is globalization an option? Public Relations Quarterly, 5-9.

Reagan, J., Anderson, R., Sumner, J., & Hill, S. (Spring 1990). A factor analysis of Broom and Smith's public relations roles scale. Journalism Quarterly, 67, 177-183.

Endnotes

[1]For examples of the expanded discussions on international public relations in textbooks, see Seitel, F.P. (1992). The Practice of public relations (5th ed.). New York: MacMillan Publishing Company or Wilcox, D.L., ault, P.H., & Agee, W.K. (1992). Public relations: Strategies and tactics (3rd ed.). New York: HarperCollins Publishers Inc. The Public Relations Journal addresses international topics on a regular basis, Public Relations Review (Summer, 1992) had a special issue on international public relations, and Journalism Quarterly has added an international section which does include public relations articles.

[2]Due to mailing constraints, only members whose addresses contained complete nine digit zip codes could be used. If the 20th person's address lacked a nine digit zip code, the researcher moved down the list until the next person with a nine digit zip code was found.

[3]Eight items, four each for manager and technician, originally were used to distinguish the two roles. However, a factor analysis revealed a problem with the item "Maintain media contacts and place press releases." Practitioners could not differentiate the items between the managerial and technician

role. To maintain a clear distinction, this technician item was dropped. Dropping one technician item meant dropping one managerial item in order to maintain the balance needed for the categorization procedure. "Making the communication policy decisions" item was dropped based upon its low factor loading. A practitioner's role was computed by examining the mean scores for each set of role measures. If a practitioner's mean scores were higher on the technician items, the practitioner was classified as a technician. If a practitioner's mean score was higher on the managerial items, the practitioner was classified as a manger. Consistent with Broom (1982), all ties were excluded from further analysis.

[4]The English version directions for the questionnaire were deemed too short and too direct for the Austrian respondents. The brevity was a cultural violation. Longer explanations were developed by the Austrian researchers to overcome this problem. Questionnaire items dealing with education were problematic. Due to differing educational systems, a misunderstanding occurred involving the education items in the public development section and demographic section. This translation problem led us to drop these two education items from the latter analyses.

Table 1:

Factor Analysis of the Ideal Job Items

Item Number	Factor 1	Factor 2
Item 1	.76*	.14
Item 2	.78*	.12
Item 3	.71*	.11
Item 4	.18	.65*
Item 5	-.01	.79*
Item 6	.60	.42
Item 7	.27	.61*
Item 8	.18	.58*
Item 9	.55*	.26
Item 10	.46	.54

Factor 1: Eigenvalue = 3.84 38.4% variance explained

Factor 2: Eigenvalue = 1.21 12.1% variance explained

---

*Denotes the highest factor loading where the item loaded at least .50 on one factor and not more than .40 on a second factor.

Table 2:

Factor Analysis of Actual Job Items

Item Number	Factor 1 Autonomy	Factor 2 Prestige
Item 1	.79*	.19
Item 2	.83*	.13
Item 3	.56*	.27
Item 4	.25	.65*
Item 5	.06	.81*
Item 6	.62	.47
Item 7	.55	.41
Item 8	.19	.72*
Item 9	.61*	.08
Item 10	.76*	.16

Factor 1: Eigenvalue = 4.34 43.4% variance explained

Factor 2: Eigenvalue = 1.18 11.8% variance explained

---

*Denotes the highest factor loading where the item loaded at least .50 on one factor and not more than .40 on a second factor.

Table 3:

Scores for the Dimensions of Culture

POWER DISTANCE		
	United States	40
	Norway	31
	Austria	11
	Mean for all countries	51
INDIVIDUALISM		
	United States	91
	Norway	69
	Austria	55
	Mean for all countries	51
UNCERTAINTY REDUCTION		
	United States	46
	Norway	50
	Austria	70
	Mean for all countries	64
MASCULINITY		
	United States	62
	Norway	8
	Austria	79
	Mean for all countries	51